

Brief discussions accompany the various maps. These are helpful for a very *general* orientation (and that is, of course, all for which they are intended). A few typographical errors occur, as for example the date "1520" given on p. 42 for Luther's venturing west to Worms (but the correct date of 1521 is supplied on the accompanying map on p. 43), and the mention on p. 58 of Plate 28 as referring to Britain when it is actually Plate 27 that shows Britain. On Plate 25 (p. 49) the boundary between Schwyz and Uri has been omitted, and on Plate 19 (p. 39) it might have been well to indicate the city of Güns inasmuch as it is mentioned in the accompanying text on p. 38.

The author recognizes the lack of attention to Christianity outside western Europe: "When speaking of possible omissions one must certainly acknowledge that this volume is at least as myopic as its predecessors in its almost exclusive concentration on the western church. The story of certain eastern groups has been ignored as if the only movements of significance occurred between the Mediterranean and the Arctic Circle. Hopefully another edition may one day correct this and picture for example the Monophysites of Egypt, Nubia, Ethiopia, and Syria who were contemporaries of both Gregory I and Charles the Great. Perhaps we might then also look at the vast expanse of land covered by Nestorian missionaries, extending from the Caspian Sea to India, Ceylon, and even China by the seventh century. The great story of the Russian Church is certainly not adequately portrayed by simply noting the lines of mission expansion to the area, as we have done. Here also a selection has been made, hopefully to be amended and supplemented later." This reviewer would hope, too, that another, enlarged edition of this atlas may appear. In the meantime, the present contribution is a significant one and provides a most useful tool indeed for the student of medieval and Reformation church history.

Good indexes to the maps and to the text have been included. And there is an interesting bonus: On the various pages of text there appear some 30 small photographic reproductions of significant woodcuts, drawings, portraits, etc., from the periods covered.

Andrews University

KENNETH A. STRAND

Avi-Yonah, Michael, *The Holy Land From the Persian to the Arab Conquests (536 B.C. to A.D. 640): A Historical Geography*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1966. 231 pp., 24 maps. \$5.95.

This book is written by the foremost expert in the field of the geography of Palestine in Hellenistic and Roman times. The author was first connected for years with the Department of Antiquities of Palestine, and later with the Hebrew University, where he still serves as Professor of Archaeology. Some 30 years ago he published his first major work, a "Map of Roman Palestine" which appeared with an accompanying text in the *QDAP*, V (1935), 139-193. This work, consisting of map and text, was later published in a revised and expanded

form in Hebrew, which has gone through three editions (1949, 1951, 1962). The present work under review presents an English translation which has again been revised and brought up to date by its author. It contains 24 sketch maps in line drawings, but lacks the large map (1:330,000) which accompanied the Hebrew editions.

The work, well documented in 1442 footnotes, is divided into three parts of very unequal length. Part One (pp. 11-125) presents in ten chapters the fluctuating boundaries and geographical adjustments made from the time of the Persians through the Hellenistic and Roman periods up to the end of the Byzantine rule over the country. Part Two (pp. 127-180) consists of only one chapter and discusses the city territories, mainly in Roman times. Part Three (pp. 181-222) contains three chapters, one on the Roman road system, another one on the economy of the country based on its geographical conditions, and a third on the people who lived in the country in the periods under discussion, and on the size of its population. Seven pages of indices of geographical names, of persons and peoples, and of subject matter conclude this extremely valuable book.

It is also an excellent reference work. Some chapters, especially that of Part Two, make heavy reading but the historical chapters of Part One, and especially those of Part Three, are most interesting and instructive. Needless to say, a work which is the ripe fruit of decades of study by an expert in ancient geography contains hardly anything worth criticizing. Therefore, the following remarks merely deal with matters of interpretation in which this reviewer does not find himself in agreement with the author.

For example, the author questions whether the cities of Lod, Hadid and Ono, lying in the coastal plain, were part of the Province of Judaea during the Persian period (pp. 17, 18). He points out that they are mentioned in the list of the Jews returning from the Babylonian captivity (Ezr 2:33; Neh 7:37), but not in the lists of the builders of Nehemiah's wall. He therefore thinks that the three places were simply Jewish villages outside of the Province of Judaea. However, it should be remembered that these three places do occur in the list of Jewish settlements presented in Neh 11:34, 35, together with Zeboim and Neballat. While the location of Zeboim is uncertain, although it probably was near Lod, Neballat, now *Beit Nabala*, lay four miles northeast of Lod. This indicates that in Nehemiah's time, the number of Jewish villages in that far-off area of the province had increased from three to five. That these villages were not represented by workmen in Nehemiah's building program, may have been due to their exposed location bordering on the territory of hostile Samaria. Furthermore, Avi-Yonah thinks that the choice of the plain of Ono by Sanballat as a place of meeting with Nehemiah (Neh 6:2) shows that it was outside of Judaea. Again, one can interpret this suggestion in a different way, for it is quite possible that part of the plain of Ono lay outside the territory of Judaea, or even that Sanballat was willing to meet on Judaeian territory, though in a place lying close to his homeland, in

order to make a meeting with Nehemiah somewhat more palatable than if it would have had to take place on Samaritan territory. That Lod and two neighboring places were taken from Samaria and turned over to Judaea by Demetrius II of Syria in the Maccabean period (1 Macc 10:30; 11:34; Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. 4.9) is no proof that it had already been part of Samaria in the Persian period, as Avi-Yonah assumes (p. 24.) Since we know so little of the history of Judaea from the end of the 5th to the 3rd cent. B.C., it is impossible to say at what time these places in the coastal area had changed hands and had become part of Samaria. When all is said, it seems to this reviewer that the evidence is not strong enough to question the records of Ezra and Nehemiah which make Lod, Hadid and Ono part of the Province of Judaea.

Avi-Yonah also wants to exclude some southern cities, such as Hebron, En-rimmon, Lachish, etc. (mentioned in Ezr and Neh), from the territory of the Province of Judaea (pp. 14, 15, 52), mainly because their inclusion would have made the province stronger than it seems to have been according to the available historical sources. Pointing to the small size of Judaea in the later period, he says that there is "no known historical event which would justify such a drastic reduction of the area of Judah." However, this reviewer sees in the migration of the Edomites-Idumaeans into southern Judaea in the 3rd cent. B.C. the historical event responsible for the loss of that territory to Judaea. It is quite possible that the Idumaeans, when pushed out of their homeland by the Nabataeans, did not move into a geographical vacuum, but pushed the inhabitants of southern Judaea toward the north and took over their territory.

On pp. 24, 25, Avi-Yonah suggests that Sichem/Shechem was "almost certainly" a district capital during the Persian domination of the country. The recent excavations of Shechem by the Drew-McCormick Archaeological Expedition have clearly shown that Shechem had an extremely small population during the Persian period, and could hardly have been important enough to serve as a district capital. Its repopulation did not take place until after the expulsion of the citizens of Samaria by Alexander the Great (see G. E. Wright, *Shechem* [New York, 1965], pp. 170-180).

For the Eshmunazer inscription from Sidon Avi-Yonah favors a date in the Ptolemaic period, giving as his chief reason the fact that "the title 'Lord of the Kings' appears many times in Semitic epigraphy, and always in connection with the Ptolemies" (p. 38). The author fails to mention that this occurs in Aramaic on the Saqqara Papyrus (*mr' mlkn*) already in the early 6th century B.C., where it refers to the Egyptian king. It is therefore still possible to date Eshmunazer in the Persian period as many scholars have done.

The author considers the statement of Jn 12:21 in error according to which Bethsaida belonged to Galilee (p. 138). This question has frequently been discussed, and many scholars have defended the accuracy of John. One reference may suffice. J. H. Bernhard says in his

discussion of Jn 12:21 in the *Intern. Crit. Comm.*: "There is abundance of evidence that the northeastern side of the lake, where Bethsaida is situated, was reckoned as in the province of Galilee by the year A.D. 80."

That the treatment of the various sites is not exhaustive is demonstrated by a comparison of the article on the history of Heshbon-Esbus in this number of the *AUSS* and Avi-Yonah's discussion of that city, but it is equally obvious from a study of the pertinent material that no important source material has been overlooked by Avi-Yonah. He has certainly put all those in his debt who are interested in the ancient history and geography of the Holy Land by giving them such a fine study. This reviewer belongs to those who have learned from this book, even with regard to subjects where he tends to disagree with the author.

Andrews University

SIEGFRIED H. HORN

Barclay, William, *The First Three Gospels*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966. 317 pp. \$2.65.

William Barclay in his usual lucid style has contributed another useful book to the field of NT studies. The book had its origin as articles in the *British Weekly*. These have been considerably expanded in this volume. It is intended as a comprehensive introduction (in the technical sense) to the Synoptic Gospels, even discussing at length such matters as the priority of Mt and the calendrical theory of Mk.

It is in the first chapter that Barclay's basic thesis for the study of the Gospels is put forth. In discussing the problem of faith and history, he emphasizes the necessity of "happenedness" as a basis for faith. "The facts will not in themselves beget faith, but unless the facts are there faith cannot even arise" (p. 41). Throughout this first chapter and throughout the book the teacher in Barclay stands out. He uses excellent illustrations and adds interesting tidbits of information wherever possible which are usually omitted in serious scholarly works. More scholars can use Barclay's method with profit.

In the second chapter he discusses form criticism at length with fairness and sympathy, so much so that it is difficult at times to know whether he is describing what the form critics are saying or what he himself really feels. However, in the following chapter he assesses more systematically what he accepts of form criticism and where he would draw the line. He says: "It is our conclusion that the Form Critics have done an immeasurable service in enabling us to understand the formation, the genesis and the aim of the gospels, but that their one mistake is their failure to see that the gospel writers sought to awaken faith by showing Jesus as he was" (p. 115). While we could not have expected a full-scale criticism of form criticism, this seems to be much too cavalier a treatment of it. It would have been better if he had taken a few significant pericopes and treated them in detail to illustrate his conclusions. The students for whom he is writing would